

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-21 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 19-21 are hereby added. Claims 1-18 stand rejected.

**Obviousness Rejection**

The Examiner has rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): (1) claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 as being obvious over *Guss, III* (US 5,062,807; hereinafter “*Guss*”) in view of *Fuchs et al.* (US 6,652,293; hereinafter “*Fuchs*”); (2) claim 2 as being unpatentable over *Guss* in view of *Fuchs* and *Boyle* (US 5,620,333; hereinafter “*Boyle*”); (3) claim 4 as being unpatentable over *Guss* in view of *Fuchs* and *Arnett* (US 5,238,426; hereinafter “*Arnett*”); and (4) claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 as being unpatentable over *Guss* in view of *Fuchs*, *Arnett* and *Archer* (US 5,125,852; hereinafter “*Archer*”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of *Guss*, *Fuchs* or *Arnett* (alone or in combination) teach or suggest independent claim 1, 3 and 4’s recitation of “a discrete connection terminal connected to said circuitry pattern on said board and to at least one conductor among said conductors of said cable, extending in a first direction therebetween, and comprising opposite ends in the first direction which terminate within the auxiliary machinery and are covered by the auxiliary machinery in the first direction.”

Specifically, the Examiner relies upon *Guss* to allegedly show many of the features recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 4, including the “connection terminal,” which is compared to *Guss*’s contact 23. However, both ends of *Guss*’s contact 23 are not “covered by the auxiliary

machinery in the first direction,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 4. Rather, one end of *Guss*’s contact 23 is exposed at an outer side of *Guss*’s connector assembly 10 (see FIG. 4).<sup>1</sup>

The secondarily applied references, *Fuchs* and *Arnett*, are equally deficient in this regard.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 3 and 4 are patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2 and 5-18 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

#### **New Claims**

Claims 19-21 are hereby added. Claims 19-21 are fully supported by the instant Application, and are respectfully submitted to be allowable both by virtue of their dependency, and by virtue of the features recited therein.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-21 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-21.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants’ representative briefly discussed these differences with the Examiner in a teleconference on November 9, 2005. It is Applicants’ representative’s understanding that the Examiner agrees that the recited features discussed above are not shown in the currently applied references.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/670,524

Attorney Docket #: Q77632

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this  
application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen  
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 21, 2006